

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the application. Applicant has canceled claim 18, amended claims 1- 2, 19-21 and 28, and withdrawn claims 7-17 and 29-31. Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks.

Change of Address

The office action was sent to Bacon & Thomas, PLLC, 625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor, Alexandria, VA 22314. Applicant respectfully requests that all future correspondence for this patent application be sent to Customer No. 23123.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) and 37 CFR (p)(5). Applicant has amended the drawings as shown in the following chart.

FIGs	New add/delete reference numbers	Referenced numbers revised
Fig1	Add: "2112" "2181" "21821" Delete: "218C" "218C1" "218C2""218C3" "218C4""218C5" "21831" "21833" Delete: "21832" Delete: "2183" Add: "218A61" "214" "2131" "218B" "2181" "21821"	"21941" should point to the gap. add arrow to line "5" line "2147" and number are cluttered line "2148" and number are cluttered line "219" point to the ball.
Fig.2	Delete: "218C2""218C3" "218C4""21831" "21833" Add: "2113" Add: line "5" and add arrow to the line "5"	"2A" changed to "24" line "21121"'s pointing direction line "21131" should point to the gap. "223"s pointing direction

Fig.3	Add: "2113""21121""21113"	"2A"changes to "24"
Fig.4		Add arrow to line "5"
Fig.5	Add: "218A5""214""2143"	Line "2148"s pointing direction
Fig.5A	Add: "2162"	
Fig.5B		Line "216"s pointing direction
Fig.5C	Delete: "2183"	"21886" is revised to "218B6" "2193"s pointing direction
Fig.8	Add: "28"	"28" is revised to "272"
Fig.9	Add: "232"	"222" is revised to "200"
Fig.10	Delete: "218A'2" "218A'5""218B'2" "218B'5" Delete one of "53"	"52" is revised to 50" "53" is revised to "55" "2A" is revised to "24"
Fig.11		"2A" is revised to "24"
Fig.11a		"2A" is revised to "24"

Further, the Applicant has amended the specification to replace "oscillating axle 2141" with "oscillating axle 2142" in each instance it is used and replace "support plate 2A" with "support plate 24." No new matter was entered. Applicant believes that every concern of the Examiner has been addressed and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Objections to the Specification

The specification has been objected to for containing informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions, which address the Examiner's concerns. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

Objections to Claims

The Examiner has objected to claim 2 because of an informality. Applicant has amended claim 2 as suggested by the Examiner, to insert the word --to-- after the word “connects” in line 2. Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claim 2 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Posey et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,729,665, hereinafter “Posey”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and request reconsideration of the claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 18. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is allowable.

Claim 2 depends from allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 2 is allowable, for among other reasons, for depending from an allowable base claim.

Applicant respectfully requests that the anticipation rejections of claims 1 and 2 be withdrawn.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 3-6 and 18-28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated these claims would be allowable if the claims were rewritten in independent form. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 18 and all claims have been amended to properly depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable.

Confirmation of Allowed Claims

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his confirmation of the patentable subject matter of claims 3-6 and 18-28.

Regarding Doctrine of Equivalents

Applicants hereby declare that any amendments herein that are not specifically made for the purpose of patentability are made for other purposes, such as clarification, and that no such changes shall be construed as limiting the scope of the claims or the application of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Appl. No.: 10/565,733
Amdt. dated July 31, 2008
Reply of Office action of April 1, 2008

Docket No. CUI-12286

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

It is requested that a one-month extension of time be granted for the filing of this response, and the appropriate extension filing fee of \$60.00 is enclosed herewith.

If any fees, including extension of time fees or additional claims fees, are due as a result of this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 19-0513. This authorization is intended to act as a constructive petition for an extension of time, should an extension of time be needed as a result of this response. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 31, 2008

By /Albert L. Schmeiser/
Albert L. Schmeiser
Reg. No. 30,681

SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS LLP
18 East University Drive, #101
Mesa, AZ 85201
(480) 655-0073
Customer No. 23123

Appl. No.: 10/565,733

Amdt. dated July 31, 2008

Reply of Office action of April 1, 2008

Docket No. CUI-12286

APPENDIX